From: <u>Mustian, Ben</u>

To: Stark, David; Weston Adams; Boyd, Jocelyn; Shannon Bobertz; Emily Johnson; Dickman, Jacquelyn S.;

Wessinger-Hill, JoAnne; PSC Contact; Court Walsh; Steve Davidson; Bateman, Andrew; Grube-Lybarker, Carri;

Hall, Roger; Lorianne Riggin; Parrish, Duane; Martinez, Sara

Cc: Butler, David; Hancock, Sonya; Schmieding, Janice; Duke, Daphne; PSC Contact; Moser, Sandra

Subject: RE: Revised proposed consent schedule: Docket Nos. 2022-93-E & 2022-97-E

Date: Thursday, May 5, 2022 3:54:45 PM

Order No 2022-271.pdf image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.png

David.

Attachments:

I apologize for any confusion I may have caused. As mentioned in my email below, the Commission issued the attached Order No. 2022-271 on April 28. Therein, the Commission stated that ORS and the Applicants had consented to the following schedule, which was the schedule originally proposed by the parties back on March 15:

Convene the hearing to satisfy statutory requirements – May 12, 2022 ORS and Other Parties Testimony due – June 15, 2022 Applicant Rebuttal Testimony due – June 29, 2022 ORS Surrebuttal Testimony due – July 13, 2022 Full witness hearing – July 18, 2022

The Order further advised that the Commission had a scheduling conflict on July 18 and asked the parties to confer about new dates.

You are correct that you issued a hearing officer directive on April 14 (two weeks prior to the Commission's Order) approving the schedule you outlined below. But due to the timing of the Commission order, ORS and the Applicant were of the belief that additional changes to the schedule were needed and that the parties needed to confer with you as the hearing officer about these issues.

In conjunction with this issue, I understand the Applicant was considering filing a request with the Commission to modify the July hearing date. Given that their potential request coincided with the issuance of Commission Order No. 2022-271, the Applicant and ORS took that into consideration when proposing a new hearing timeframe, which we understood the Commission was directing us to do in Order No. 2022-271.

I now understand that the issuance of the Order may have been out of time, which caused our confusion. If that is correct, then I understand the currently approved schedule is as you stated below:

May 12: brief convening of hearing with only counsel present, to satisfy statutory requirement to convene proceeding within 60 to 90 days of application being filed.

June 8: ORS and Other Parties Testimony due

June 22: Applicant Rebuttal Testimony due

July 1: ORS Surrebuttal Testimony due

July 13: Full witness hearing

Although this is the schedule you noted below, I would appreciate it if you could confirm that

this is the currently approved schedule so that we all are certain of the baseline off of which we are working.

Finally, I have spoken with counsel for the Applicant and understand that they still may request a modification to the hearing date. But I understand they will be submitting a more formal request in that regard should they choose to do so.

I am sure that I have made everything as clear as mud, but appreciate your patience and for working with us to clear up any confusion.

Thank you and please let me know if there are further questions.

Ben Mustian

From: Stark, David <david.stark@psc.sc.gov>

Sent: Thursday, May 5, 2022 2:22 PM

To: Mustian, Ben <BMustian@ors.sc.gov>; Weston Adams <weston.adams@nelsonmullins.com>; Boyd, Jocelyn <Jocelyn.Boyd@psc.sc.gov>; Shannon Bobertz <BobertzS@dnr.sc.gov>; Emily Johnson <ejohnson@scprt.com>; Dickman, Jacquelyn S. <DICKMAJS@dhec.sc.gov>; Wessinger-Hill, JoAnne <JoAnne.Hill@psc.sc.gov>; PSC_Contact <Contact@psc.sc.gov>; Court Walsh <court.walsh@nelsonmullins.com>; Steve Davidson <steve.davidson@nelsonmullins.com>; Bateman, Andrew <abateman@ors.sc.gov>; Grube-Lybarker, Carri <clybarker@scconsumer.gov>; Hall, Roger <RHall@scconsumer.gov>; Lorianne Riggin <RigginL@dnr.sc.gov>; Parrish, Duane <dparrish@scprt.com>; Martinez, Sara <martinsv@dhec.sc.gov>

Cc: Butler, David <David.Butler@psc.sc.gov>; Hancock, Sonya <sonya.hancock@psc.sc.gov>; Schmieding, Janice <Janice.Schmieding@psc.sc.gov>; Duke, Daphne <Daphne.Duke@psc.sc.gov>; PSC_Contact <Contact@psc.sc.gov>; Moser, Sandra <Sandra.Moser@psc.sc.gov>

Subject: RE: Revised proposed consent schedule: Docket Nos. 2022-93-E & 2022-97-E

Importance: High

Parties:

There are two issues I need to address directly.

The first: I would ask the parties please fill out the following virtual media plan survey, so we have all the appropriate information to enable us to use technology in furtherance of our hearing(s). That link is here:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/3JCBN59

The second issue: It appears there has been some miscommunication on the scheduling of the hearing(s) and I would like to resolve it at this time.

There was a schedule proposed by the parties that had the following:

May 12: brief convening of hearing with only counsel present, to satisfy statutory requirement to convene proceeding within 60 to 90 days of application being filed.

June 8: ORS and Other Parties Testimony due June 22: Applicant Rebuttal Testimony due July 1: ORS Surrebuttal Testimony due

July 13: Full witness hearing

I understand this was the desire of the parties. On April 14, after emails between the parties and an acknowledgement that a status conference would be difficult to put together, I issued Hearing Officer Directive 2022-32-H available here: https://dms.psc.sc.gov/Attachments/Matter/42125da5-6c64-4423-bc29-53ff2dc59a52

If this Directive was not appropriately distributed to you, please let me know and I assure you it will be addressed.

In that Directive, I have approved the proposed schedule, with a merits hearing on July 13. Now, I need the parties to understand – as I emphasized in the Directive – that, should the hearing take longer than that ONE day, July 13, that we would have to continue at a future, non-contiguous date due to conflicts in the Commission's schedule.

Now, I need to understand EXACTLY what the parties want to do here. If the parties are jointly requesting to deviate from that approved schedule, I need to know.

If I have in any way inadvertently mislead the parties, I deeply apologize and would like to correct any and all ambiguities at this time.

Sincere Regards, David Stark

From: Mustian, Ben < Bent: Thursday, May 5, 2022 11:01 AM

To: Stark, David david.stark@psc.sc.gov">david.stark@psc.sc.gov; Weston Adams weston.adams@nelsonmullins.com; Boyd, Jocelyn david.son@nelsonmullins.com; Shannon Bobertz BobertzS@dnr.sc.gov; Emily Johnson ejohnson@scprt.com; Dickman, Jacquelyn S. DICKMAJS@dhec.sc.gov; Wessinger-Hill, JoAnne JoAnne.Hill@psc.sc.gov; PSC_Contact Contact@psc.sc.gov; Court Walsh court.walsh@nelsonmullins.com; Steve Davidson steve.davidson@nelsonmullins.com;

Rateman, Andrew abateman@ors.sc.gov">abateman, Andrew abateman@ors.sc.gov; Grube-Lybarker, Carri clybarker@scconsumer.gov; Hall, Roger Rarrish, Duane dparrish@scprt.com; Martinez, Sara martinsv@dhec.sc.gov

Cc: Butler, David <<u>David.Butler@psc.sc.gov</u>>; Hancock, Sonya <<u>sonya.hancock@psc.sc.gov</u>>; Schmieding, Janice <<u>Janice.Schmieding@psc.sc.gov</u>>; Duke, Daphne <<u>Daphne.Duke@psc.sc.gov</u>>; PSC_Contact <<u>Contact@psc.sc.gov</u>>

Subject: RE: Revised proposed consent schedule: Docket Nos. 2022-93-E & 2022-97-E

David,

As you know, ORS and the Applicants in the above-referenced matters have been working together to propose a consent procedural schedule for the Commission's consideration. On April 28, 2022, the Commission issued Order No. 2022-271 advising that, while the parties consented to holding the substantive hearing in this matter on July 18, the Commission needs to explore alternatives to that date due to a scheduling conflict. Accordingly, the Commission directed the parties to discuss with the Hearing Officer an alternative procedural schedule for filing testimony and exhibits and to advise if beginning the hearing at a different date and time is agreeable.

After discussing this matter, ORS and the Applicants have agreed to the following proposed testimony and hearing schedule:

Convene the hearing to satisfy statutory requirements – May 12, 2022

ORS and Other Parties Testimony due – June 15, 2022

Applicant Rebuttal Testimony due – June 29, 2022

ORS Surrebuttal Testimony due – July 13, 2022

Full witness hearing – On a date suitable to the Commission to begin between August 23 and August 30, 2022.

For clarity, this proposal would maintain the currently agreed upon testimony dates and would provide for the substantive hearing to begin sometime between August 23 through 30, 2022, on a date convenient to the Commission.

I would appreciate it if any of the statutory parties would advise of any objection to the proposed consent schedule.

Otherwise, please let us know if the Commission has any concern with these dates and if a date sometime between August 23 through 30 to commence the hearing in this matter is acceptable to the Commission.

Thank you.

Ben Mustian



Benjamin P. Mustian

Deputy General Counsel, Legal DepartmentOffice of Regulatory Staff

☑ BMUSTIAN@ORS.SC.GOV
☑ (803) 737-0898

2 1401 Main Street, Suite 900 Columbia, SC 29201

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential, proprietary, and/or privileged material. Any review, transmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking any action in reliance upon this information, by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from all computers.